



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Other resolutions of the conference were as follows:

Upon motion of Mr. Cremer, as amended by Baron d'Estournelles, the conference declared in favor of national commissions for consideration of the question of armaments, with a view to an international agreement to arrest or reduce them, and also for the placing of this question upon the program of the approaching Hague Conference.

On motion of Signor Bruniati (Italy) and of M. Louis Franck (Belgium), the conference adopted resolutions declaring for:

1. The definition of "Contraband of war" as being restricted to arms, explosives, and munitions of war.

2. Reasserting and confirming the principle that it is not proper to destroy either ships carrying contraband of war or goods on board such ships which are not contraband of war.

3. Universal consent to the inviolability of private property at sea in time of war.

Upon motion of M. Beernaert, ex-Prime Minister of Belgium, who is now a senator, it was requested that the employment of new types of instruments of war and the bombardment of undefended ports, towns, and villages should be placed upon the program of the approaching Hague Conference.

Upon motion of Dr. Albert Gobat, general secretary of our Union (member of the Swiss Parliament), it was resolved that the forthcoming Hague Conference should consider and more clearly define the rights and duties of neutrals in time of war.

Upon my own motion, it was unanimously declared that each group of our Union should take steps immediately to secure from their government an annual appropriation in aid of the work of the Interparliamentary Union and of the general movement for the substitution of arbitration for force in international affairs.

You will observe that these far-reaching recommendations divide themselves into two classes:

First: Those that can be effectuated only by general consent of the powers.

Second: Those that any one nation can effectuate by its own individual action.

I will address a separate note to you in regard to the second class, confining myself here to action that should be taken in concert with other powers, either at or after the forthcoming Conference at The Hague.

By securing the indorsement of the foregoing progressive ideas by this Union, composed of over 2,000 members of national legislative bodies, the arbitration group of our Congress has opened the door for some Chief Executive to take the lead in effectuating these things which are indispensable to the peace, prosperity, and further progress not only of our country but of all nations. The conditions which now confront us seem to make this work appertain more directly to you than to any other Chief Executive.

The forthcoming Conference at The Hague was called upon your initiative, and this action was based upon the resolution of our Union adopted at its first American session, upon motion of American members of our body. This second Conference at The Hague will be participated in by all American nations, and this fact is due to American initiative.

We are therefore upon the eve of what may be cor-

rectly called the "American Conference at The Hague," and we will not disappoint the world by failing to make that Conference produce results proportionate to the possibilities of this hour and to the rightful place of the United States in the politics of the world.

Nothing impractical has been proposed, but simply the attempting of all that is now possible. The hour has struck for realizing these things, and the prestige that you obtained throughout the world by your successful intervention in the war between Russia and Japan and by other acts in bringing the Hague Court into operation points to you as the Chief Executive who should lead in espousing ideas which have already found advocates among the most eminent jurists and legislators of every advanced nation.

Happily the political conditions of our country insure your receiving the support of the leaders of all political parties. The party to which you belong declared for arbitration at its last national convention. The elected leader of the Democratic party in the House is a member of our Union, and both he and the acknowledged leader of the Democratic party in the country participated in the recent conference at London. Both of them contributed valuable ideas, which were adopted by the conference, and exerted their influence in causing our Union to declare for this progressive platform. Shortly after bringing forward this proposition I declared that it was one upon which good people in every country and of every shade of political opinion could stand together, regardless of the forms of the country's constitution and of the national policies with which their party may be associated. Events have justified my hopes, but in no country more conspicuously than in our own.

Assured that you will be led to do all that is wise and right at this critical moment, I tender you my services to aid in all possible ways, and beg to remain,

Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD BARTHOLDT,
President of the American Group.

Glorification of Justice, Not of War.

One of the chief influences that went to defeat in the Wisconsin Legislature the bill appropriating \$25,000 for the Jamestown Exposition was the speech of the Socialist Representative, Hon. Carl D. Thompson. In publishing this powerful speech, with its noble protest against the proposed military and naval display of the Exposition, and against war in general, we must not be understood to express our approval of all the positions taken by Mr. Thompson. He said:

If this were an appropriation for educational, historical, economic, commercial or industrial purposes, we would not object. If it were to build better schools and colleges, to educate or to uplift our people, or for any purpose that would elevate and purify humanity, then Socialists would most heartily support it.

But this Jamestown Exposition has become chiefly and primarily military in its purpose. It is to be distinctly and emphatically, according to the public statements of those who have it in charge, "a glorification of war,"

which is to present to the people who attend "a great living picture of war with all its enticing splendors."

A recent publication of the bulletin of the organization having the Exposition in charge says:

"The Exposition will be primarily a military and naval celebration; commercialism will be relegated to the rear."

The bulletin announces thirty-eight "attractions." Eighteen of them are distinctly military, and the following are samples:

Greatest military spectacle the world has ever seen.

Grandest naval rendezvous in history.

International races of submarine warships.

Magnificent pyrotechnic reproduction of war scenes.

Reproduction of the famous battle between the "Monitor" and "Merrimac" (\$10,000 has been set aside for this event alone).

Greatest gathering of warships in the history of the world.

Greatest array of gorgeous military uniforms ever seen.

The grandest military and naval celebration ever attempted in any age by any nation.

A great living picture of war with all its enticing splendors.

Farther on we are told, "The Jamestown Exposition will be a continuous and varying scene of martial splendor from beginning to end."

It is perfectly clear, therefore, that the main feature of this exposition is to glorify war, to make it seem grand, splendid, enticing.

Now, gentlemen, Socialism is opposed to war. The Social-Democratic movement all over the earth is working, voting, hoping, struggling for peace. And because we are opposed to war and feel that in this enlightened age this relic of barbarism is utterly unnecessary, therefore we are absolutely opposed to any measure calculated to foster the military spirit or to encourage or stimulate it. We are opposed to this appropriation because:

(1) It is an attempt to foist upon our people a monstrous deception. This exposition will try to throw about war the glint and tinsel of militarism to make it seem glorious and exalted. But war is hell. It is wholesale, legalized murder. It destroys commerce, paralyzes industry, impoverishes the people, robs millions of men of the richest years of their lives. It opens countless graves where happy homes should be; fills the world with widows and orphans; drenches our fields with blood; bathes the world with tears and fills the world with hate. War is hell, and it should never be painted otherwise. He who attempts it attempts a monstrous lie.

(2) Again, we oppose this measure from another motive. We do not want to encourage in any way the spirit of war, because to-day, with the light and knowledge we have, war is utterly uncalled for and unparadonable.

It is said that war is inevitable — that we must have it now and then. But this is true only from the standpoint of capitalism. It is true that capitalism cannot live without war. But let this have its full force and significance. Chauncey M. Depew said once in one of his flights of oratory, "What means this hammering at the gates of Peking, this marching of troops to Central

Africa? Simply this, that the American people have produced many millions of dollars' worth of wealth each year more than they can consume."

And here is the truth uncovered. And what does it mean? This, that the capitalistic system robs those who toil of a large part of the products of their labor. Thus their purchasing power is destroyed. They produce two dollars' worth of wealth, but they are paid but one. Clearly they cannot buy back as much as they have produced. And therefore the surplus accumulates. And out of this situation grows the struggle for markets. And in this struggle for markets, for industrial supremacy, arises the international complications that lead almost certainly to wars.

But here is a better way, — and we want every opportunity to urge it. Here and now we offer and will continue to urge a peaceful solution of the social and economic problems both national and international. And that solution lies in the direction of economic justice. Give the millions that toil the full products of their toil and they will be able to buy out of the market the full amount of wealth which their labor has put there. This will tend to peace at home and abroad. For then there will be justice, and after justice will come peace. And we are offering here and now the outlines of the program by which this economic justice may be secured. It is justice we want. And therefore we wish to glorify Justice, and not war.

(3) And again we oppose this appropriation because there are so many good and useful things for which this money might a thousand times better be spent. Take this \$25,000 and build better schools or extend your university equipment. Invest it in university extension, or in the scientific experimentation with new and better types of grains and animals for the farmers of this State. Or buy with it a public park on the shores of the lake by our city wilderness, where now and then the weary and the worn, the poor, who through the summer heat swelter in the squalor of our city slums, may go out and breathe God's sweet air —

"With the sky above their heads
And the grass beneath their feet."

Do this and you will bless humanity, you will help the people of this State. But spend it in the glorification of war, and you feed the worst passions of our modern brutality. One battleship costs more than the whole university equipment of this State. And twenty minutes of the fiendish hell of war will suffice to send it and all its terrific equipment to the bottom of the sea.

(4) We are opposed to this measure because it would tend to perpetuate a burden that bears especially hard upon the working classes. Do not forget that it is the working class that fight all the battles. It is not the railroad presidents, or the trust magnates, or the millionaires or their sons that shoulder the musket. They hire substitutes, and stay at home and work up booms for the "glory of war," and draw the dividends. The Social-Democrats see through this fraud and strive to have it cease. In Europe at different times the workers, massed in the Socialistic movement, have prevented war by refusing to join in this glorification of war. And in proportion to its strength here in America we shall do the same.

The world has enough anguish, enough broken, bleeding hearts, enough tears. Now let us turn our faces towards the light of a better day. Let us wipe away their tears; let us heal the broken-hearted; let us bring peace upon the earth. Let us live and labor for "peace on earth, good will among men," for the higher, better, holier, civilization in which "they shall beat their swords into plowshares, their spears into pruning-hooks"; when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Famines and Militarism.

From a Sermon on the Russian Famine, by Rev. Edward Cummings, at the South Congregational Church, Boston, March 3, 1907.

If there is abundant grain to be had in Siberia, and only a dollar's worth a month is needed to save a life, why, in heaven's name, men exclaim, does not the Russian government stop building battleships and go to buying grain? Why does not it stop raising loans to buy the munitions of war to fight other nations, and go to raising loans to save the lives of these starving millions of its own subjects?

That is a perfectly obvious and reasonable question. Everybody asks it. But there is no answer but the grim fact that nations do become so infatuated with the suicidal lust for naval and military power that the provision of battleships and munitions of war is regarded as the first necessity of national life,—more necessary even than the provision for starving millions.

On the other hand, could anything better illustrate the wicked, deluded, false condition of our national and international code of ethics than this appalling situation in Russia? Think of it! The government of one of the most powerful nations in the world, so obsessed with suicidal notions of military aggrandizement that it pleads the absolute necessity, even in time of famine, of spending millions of money buying ships and guns and preparing for war, when millions of its own people are slowly starving for lack of a dollar's worth of food per month! To such hideous consequences has the brutal and antiquated theory of international relations brought the world to-day.

Who is to blame for these conditions? What is this alleged necessity which the Russian government pleads in extenuation of its conduct to-day? Whence comes this dreadful necessity which compels it to rob starving peasants of their last crust in order that it may build battleships and buy munitions of war? Why, the "necessity" arises solely from the fact that Germany, France, England, Japan and the United States have great navies or armies, against which Russia must be prepared to defend her national honor or integrity or vanity, by an equal array of ships and men.

Yes, you say, but what dire necessity compels Germany, France, England and Japan to tax themselves almost to the limit of human endurance, until they fairly stagger under the burden of their military expenditures? Well, the answer seems almost an insult to human intelligence. The necessity that compels Germany is the fact that France, England, Russia and the others do it. The necessity which compels France is the example of Germany, England, Russia, the United States and Japan. The necessity which compels Eng-

land is the example of France, Germany, Russia and the United States. And so on and on they go, round and round this vicious circle, in a dizzy competitive war dance of mutual destruction. Each one is reluctantly, it is said, compelled to follow the fatal example of all his neighbors; and all the neighbors are compelled to follow helplessly the example of each new increase of armament, each blindly compelled by all, and all by each!

This suicidal policy of mutual distrust would of itself seem bad enough and discreditable enough to civilized nations. But this is not all. The fiendish ingenuity of this infernal machine for national self-destruction is not complete until you have added the motor which keeps it going automatically and makes it more and more destructive every year. That automatic motor is the familiar, sophisticated and self-contradictory theory that the army and navy of each separate nation must be big enough and strong enough to defeat the army and navy of any other one, or perhaps of any other two!

Never in the whole history of the human race has the Father of Lies imposed upon poor, credulous human nature with a more specious, villainous, disastrous, sinful, disgraceful, and self-contradictory falsehood than this, which is still misleading the statesmen of the civilized world to-day. As a theory of international relations, it hasn't a shred of intellectual or moral respectability about it. It does not rise to the level of clear thinking or plain dealing. It is a sophisticated delusion and snare, from which the world must extricate itself, if our civilization is to escape the horrors of self-destruction.

Fortunately for us, this nation has been able in the past to stand aloof from this deadly compact. We have been that happy and envied nation which could boast that it needed no great army or navy. Our prosperous and contented farmers and mechanics have gone singing about their work, because they did not have to carry on their backs a soldier or a sailor, as European laborers have had to do. But somehow we, too, have caught the infatuation of late. "We the people"—we the farmers and mechanics—seem to want to be in the European fashion, and have a nicely uniformed and splendidly equipped soldier or sailor on our backs as we go about our daily work. We have not yet come to the point of taking the bread from mouths of starving millions in order that we may build battleships and forts. But we have come to the point where we rob our children of the schools and colleges and opportunities for industrial training and technical education which are absolutely essential to the continued welfare and happiness and prosperity of this nation, in order that we may build battleships and buy munitions of foreign war, of which there is small prospect and less need.

And we are not robbing our own people and our own children alone by these mad endeavors to join the international war dance and follow the example of less fortunate nations and ape the military fashions of Europe. We are also doing the world a great wrong. Every unnecessary battleship we build out of our abundant wealth not only robs us of a great university or training school for our children: it also sets a new standard of military waste and extravagance, which must be adopted by peoples who are already staggering beneath burdens of militarism which they can scarcely carry.

"We the people" of the United States are in part